


REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of August 10, 2005 in which prosecution was reopened after a telephone conversation between the Examiner and the undersigned on January 5, 2005 which was held in order to advance prosecution. In that interview, the Examiner suggested that the rejections could be overcome by inserting a limitation in the independent claims 1, 2 and 5 to indicate that the display motions were mechanical so that for example in claim 5, the n-axis display platform is responsive in a passive mode to an attitudinal control signal for *mechanically* guiding a user's head to execute attitudinal movements. Such a change has been made to claim 5 in the above amendment and a similar change has been made to the other two remaining independent claims 1 and 2.

In the interview, the Examiner requested cancelling claims 22-24, 26 and 28-32 because they are distinct from claims 1-5 originally presented, but no agreement was reached. Applicant has amended claims 28, 29 and 32 to become dependent upon claim 5 but applicant reserves the right to file a continuation to pursue these claims as independent claims at a later date.

It is now believed that the remaining claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance and applicant earnestly solicits same in response to this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis J. Maguire

Attorney for the Applicant

Registration No. 31,391

FJM/djc

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS

& ADOLPHSON LLP

755 Main Street, PO Box 224

Monroe, Connecticut 06468

(203) 261-1234